

I would request that there NOT be any restrictions on copying new video sources in the digital world.

There are many fair usages that would be entirely locked out because of this ability.

To document and comment on material that has been recorded should be preserved at all costs. If one can enable any type of restriction, then this WILL be expanded. And when one reinterprets the law to an ever excluding dimension, it is theoretical that recording and recounting of historical events could become in jeopardy.

How will one comment on a news article if it cannot be recorded?
How can you ensure the integrity of a “copy” that is forced to be purchased – not the live event.

For example, a news article makes disparaging remarks about another person or political figure. If this is not allowed to be copied in life form, then how can we be sure that the copy that is “made available later for a price” has not been doctored in some way? Maybe it is just to correct some basic facts. Maybe it is to change one’s appearance. OR maybe it is to change an offending remark.

Can we risk the potential “political correctness” that would allow changing history rather than dealing with it directly? Can we risk allowing a select few to allow what content is available to be released - allowing them to approve/change any content after the fact?

Great concern should be given before locks should be allowed in this new digital world.

Since there is a new world, there are some who would like to change all rules to allow them to find new ways to make more money – in the name of losing potential profits if there way is not adopted. PLEASE REFRAIN FROM GIVING THEM MORE CONTROL.

What confidence can one have in purchasing any recording device (audio/video) if there are unknown items that the device will not be allowed to record.

Can you imagine this same restriction being placed upon cars? We will sell you a car, but we will equip it with a GPS system so that it will not be allowed into certain locations. Maybe those areas might be allowed to be used if one pays more for the privilege. I can see environmentalists using/wanting to use this. I can see people in congested areas using this to control traffic

control – limiting the number of people on a freeway – why allow them on a freeway if it exceeds the maximum number of car that the freeway was designed for. And then a second tier would/could be established: pay more and you will be allowed to “reserve” your space to drive where you wish.

As you can see, with the digital world, great care must be exercised to prevent people from using it as a way to exclude others – even in the name of fairness. If they really want fair, then make the usage of digital “flags” illegal!!